



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Am

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/668,253	09/21/2000	Andreas Bechtolsheim	CISCP540	1376

26541 7590 05/11/2005

RITTER, LANG & KAPLAN
P.O. BOX 2448
SARATOGA, CA 95070

EXAMINER

STRANGE, AARON N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2153

DATE MAILED: 05/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/668,253

Applicant(s)

BECHTOLSHEIM ET AL.

Examiner

Aaron Strange

Art Unit

2153

All Participants:

(1) Aaron Strange.

(2) Cindy S. Kaplan (40,043).

Status of Application: After final

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 2 May 2005

Time: 5:30

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

112 2nd paragraph rejection of claim 65

Claims discussed:

53 and 65

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See attachment

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Regarding claim 53, discussed 101 issue regarding "carrier wave" definition in specification (page 20). The Examiner recommended that the claim be amended to add "wherein said computer-readable storage medium is not a data signal embodied in a carrier wave" in order to limit the claim to tangible embodiments.

Regarding claim 65, discussed "maintaining the Ethernet frame" limitation, which was rejected under 112 2nd paragraph in the final Office action as well as "said header", added by amendment, which lacks antecedent basis. The Examiner recommended that the claim be amended to replace the second clause "means for modifying...the Ethernet frame" with the the second clause from claim 91, "means for modifying the Ethernet packet by inserting a header in place of the preamble within the packet while maintaining the format of the Ethernet packet, said header configured to provide support for network management" to overcome the 112 2nd paragraph rejection and provide antecedent basis for "said header"

Ms. Kaplan and the Examiner agreed to enter the Examiner's recommended amendments via Examiner's Amendment.

NOTE: At the time of this communication, additional formalities have been found by the Examiner. An additional interview will be conducted to discuss those issues prior to an Examiner's Amendment.